

**State of Michigan**  
**John Engler, Governor**

**Department of Environmental Quality**



**Russell J. Harding, Director**

**INTERNET: <http://www.deq.state.mi.us>**

**State Revolving Fund (SRF)**  
**Final Intended Use Plan - Fiscal Year 2000**

---

**Prepared by:**  
**Municipal Facilities Section, Environmental Assistance Division**  
**December 1999**

<p>The Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ) will not discriminate against any individual or group on the basis of race, sex, religion, age, national origin, color, marital status, disability or political beliefs. Questions or concerns should be directed to the MDEQ Office of Personnel Services, P.O. Box 30473, Lansing, MI 48909.</p>
---

**SRF   SRF   SRF   SRF   SRF   SRF**

## **Table of Contents**

<b>I.</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>Structure of the SRF .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>III.</b>	<b>Advantages of the SRF .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>IV.</b>	<b>Changes in the SRF .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>V.</b>	<b>Long Term Goals .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>VI.</b>	<b>Short Term Goals .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>VII.</b>	<b>Allocation of Funds .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>VIII.</b>	<b>Assurances .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>IX.</b>	<b>Criteria and Method for Distribution of Funds .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>X.</b>	<b>Project Priority .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>XI.</b>	<b>EPA Automated Clearing House Activities .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>XII.</b>	<b>Public Review and Comment .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>XIII.</b>	<b>Origination of Documents .....</b>	<b>9</b>

**Attachment 1 – Fiscal Year 2000 Project Priority List**

**Attachment 2 – Fiscal Year 2000 Quarterly Schedule/Fundable Range**

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

The State of Michigan provides a low-interest loan financing program to assist qualified local municipalities with the construction of needed water pollution control facilities. Michigan's fund is officially known as the Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund. Since its inception in 1989, however, the fund has more commonly been referred to as the **State Revolving Fund, or SRF**.

This is an important distinction to be made because Michigan also offers a similar financing program for drinking water projects. The **Drinking Water Revolving Fund** is also known as the **DWRF**.

While these two programs run on parallel tracks, there are some differences in their requirements. It is important that interested parties work with DEQ staff to increase their knowledge of these differences. This Intended Use Plan (IUP) will focus from this point forward on the SRF.

Michigan's SRF program is used by local municipalities to finance construction of their water pollution control projects. These may include wastewater treatment plant upgrades or expansions, combined sewer overflow abatement, new sewers designed to reduce existing sources of pollution, non point source pollution management measures, and other related wastewater treatment efforts. Qualified municipalities must meet federal and state program requirements, as well as demonstrate their ability to publicly finance their project.

The SRF is a state-managed program. This Fiscal Year (FY) 2000 IUP describes how the DEQ and the Michigan Municipal Bond Authority (Authority) will jointly administer the SRF during the upcoming fiscal year. The Municipal Facilities Section (MFS) of the Environmental Assistance Division (EAD) is charged with carrying out the program administration responsibilities. Financial administration of the program continues to be handled by the staff of the Authority. The administrative contacts for the SRF are as follows:

**Ms. Janet Hunter Moore, Executive Director**  
**Michigan Municipal Bond Authority**  
**Michigan Department of Treasury**  
**Treasury Building**  
**Lansing, MI 48922**  
**517-373-1728**

**Mr. Thomas Kamppinen, Chief**  
**Municipal Facilities Section**  
**Environmental Assistance Division**  
**Department of Environmental Quality**  
**PO Box 30457**  
**Lansing, MI 48909-7957**  
**Voice: 517-373-2161**  
**E-Mail: [kamppint@deq.state.mi.us](mailto:kamppint@deq.state.mi.us)**

The EPA continues to offer guidance and annual program oversight reviews, which strengthens the management of the SRF and helps to ensure consistent application of federal requirements.

## **II. STRUCTURE OF THE SRF**

From 1989 through 1992, Michigan's SRF operated as a direct loan program. Municipalities requested reimbursement for project costs and draws were processed directly upon federal and state funds as they were requested. Since 1992, however, the state has sold State Revolving Fund Revenue Bonds that are covered with a reserve drawn directly from federal and state funds. Issuance costs are covered by the bonds sold and, thus, are not identified as direct administrative expenses of the SRF. These costs have historically approximated one percent of the total issue.

It is from these bond issues that reimbursements are drawn for the local units of government. Concurrently, the EPA and state funds are deposited into the debt service reserve accounts that provide coverage for the revenue bonds.

Michigan has requested and received federal capitalization grants from the EPA since FY1989. This federal contribution has been significant, amounting to over \$690 million to date. These funds, matched by a 20 percent contribution from state sources, have created the capital pool from which the low-interest loans could be made. In addition, release funds from the reserve accounts become available as coverage requirements lapse on each bond issue sold. These moneys then become available for commitment to municipalities, along with interest and principal repayments.

The following summarizes the yearly capital contributions of both the federal and state governments:

<b>FY</b>	<b>Federal Cap Grant</b>	<b>State Match</b>	<b>Total Cap Grant</b>
1989-99	\$690,594,159	\$138,207,407	\$828,801,564
2000	\$57,900,000	\$11,580,000	\$69,480,000

### **III. ADVANTAGES OF THE SRF**

The primary advantage to Michigan municipalities is the ability to borrow funds below the market rate. As the program began, loans were offered with a 2 percent rate of interest. At the start of FY1995, this was raised to 2.25 percent. In FY1999, the rate was set at 2.5 percent. Since the fund's inception, open market rates have ranged from 5.16 to 8 percent. The relative stability of the SRF has allowed communities to more adequately plan without factoring in major market rate adjustments.

The SRF interest rate is established by the director prior to each new fiscal year. The decision is based on demand, market conditions, program costs, and future structuring needs. For FY2000, the interest rate for the SRF is 2.5 percent.

Apart from the low interest, municipalities also benefit from the SRF in that they can finance all eligible water pollution control costs. They often do not have to seek other sources or enter the market to obtain local share financing. Everything is handled by this "one-stop shopping" concept. The amount of time it takes to commence construction is greatly reduced. This streamlined approach has resulted in lower bid costs because of the tighter timeframe. It has removed the unexpected elements that occurred when communities would obtain a grant and then have to secure financing for the local share.

The SRF can also be used to fund qualified projects to abate non point sources (NPS) of pollution. The DEQ director may allocate funds between traditional point source projects and the NPS projects such as urban and agricultural runoff. There continues to be little interest from local units of government to finance projects for NPS pollution control through the SRF. The impediment likely results from the difficulty of generating a viable source of repayments for NPS projects.

EPA has noted the difficulty encountered by the states in finding viable NPS projects to include on the SRF Project Priority List (PPL). EPA is encouraging states to step up recruitment of such projects in order to focus more effort on reducing NPS pollution.

The DEQ will continue to make loans available to any Section 319 NPS project within the fundable range that can meet program requirements. *However, no project plans were submitted for FY2000 NPS projects before the July 1 submittal deadline.*

#### IV. CHANGES IN THE SRF

There have been no major changes in Michigan's SRF since last year, but the DEQ continues to pursue a modification to the program in FY2000. This change will consist of implementing EPA's Hardship Grants Program for Rural Communities.

The Omnibus Consolidated Rescissions and Appropriations Act of 1996 (P.L. 104-134) contained a \$50 million appropriation for a Hardship Grants Program, and federal guidance published on March 20, 1997 provides basic implementation detail. There have not been any additional appropriations for this. Michigan's share of the FY1996 appropriation is \$2,280,700, and when supplemented with the required 5 percent state match, results in \$2,394,735 of hardship assistance being available to municipalities participating in the SRF.

To qualify for hardship assistance, a municipality must:

1. Be a "rural" community with no more than 3,000 inhabitants;
2. Lack centralized wastewater treatment or collection systems;
3. Be located in a county with a per capita income that does not exceed 80 percent of the national average as determined by the last available U.S. Census; and
4. Be located in a county with an average unemployment rate that exceeds the national average by one percentage point or more for the July through June period preceding the start of the fiscal year.

#### V. LONG-TERM GOALS

Michigan's SRF is a primary funding source used to protect and preserve the water resources within the state's boundaries. As more and more attention is given to water pollution abatement efforts within specific watersheds, the DEQ will continue to work toward establishing tighter integration of the federal/state/local partnership. This includes efforts to satisfy EPA that the pace of Michigan's SRF is satisfactory.

The DEQ has expressed its willingness to work together with various federal and state agencies, such as the Rural Development Authority and the Michigan Economic Development Corporation, so that our agencies may collectively fund applicants and maximize use of our capital pool to protect our water resources.

Such protection of the state's waters will ultimately benefit everyone. Industry, tourism, and day-to-day quality of life are strengthened when our most valuable natural resource is preserved for our

use and enjoyment. This includes improvement of existing surface waters which suffer impairment, protection of groundwater resources from improperly treated discharges, reduction of harmful discharges from combined sewer overflows, and the protection of aquatic ecosystems which cannot thrive in conditions of degraded water quality. To this end, long-term goals for Michigan's SRF are:

- A. To achieve and maintain statewide compliance with all applicable state and federal laws, rules and standards.
- B. To protect the public health and environmental quality of our state.
- C. To further integrate principles of watershed management and water quality restoration within urban, as well as outstate areas.
- D. To secure Michigan's full share of federal funding available under Title VI and to expeditiously obligate these moneys, along with the state contributions, for the construction of water pollution control projects which meet state and federal requirements.
- E. To develop strategies within the SRF to assist smaller, hardship communities in meeting water quality standards.

## **VI. SHORT-TERM GOALS**

In order to accomplish the long-term goals, we must also focus on more immediate objectives. Therefore, our short-term goals for FY2000 are:

- A. To fund those projects identified in the IUP, enabling them to proceed with construction of facilities included in their adopted project plans.
- B. Work with other agencies and offices in developing integrated approaches in watershed management efforts.
- C. Coordinate disbursement practices with the DEQ's Office of Financial Services to ensure accurate reporting of program information for administrative/project expenditures.
- D. Establish a Small Community Hardship Assistance Program.
- E. Identify and integrate, wherever possible, outreach efforts focused on pollution prevention activities.

## **VII. ALLOCATION OF FUNDS**

Allocation of funds among eligible uses is based on a three-step process. First, the DEQ identifies the sources of funds and the spending limits for the SRF within the given fiscal year. Next, a determination of the type and amount of funding assistance necessary for each community is made. Finally, SRF funds are allocated among the projects consistent with amounts available and the priority ranking of the project.

The following information reflects the sources of funds from which communities may draw assistance during FY2000:

<b>FY2000 Title VI Funds</b>	<b>\$ 57,900,000</b>
<b>FY2000 State Match</b>	<b>\$ 11,580,000</b>
<b>Other Funds</b>	
<b>(loan repayments, earnings, and other program funds)</b>	<b><u>\$166,448,000</u></b>
<b>Total Expected Sources of Funds for FY2000</b>	<b>\$235,928,000</b>

From these funds, however, the costs of administering the SRF are also drawn. As permitted in Section 603(d)(7) of the federal Clean Water Act, Michigan will continue to reserve up to 4 percent of the cumulative federal capitalization amounts to cover the administrative expenses of operating the SRF (\$2,316,000). Allowing for bid overruns (\$23,612,000), \$210,000,000 is available for project funding during FY2000. These funds will be drawn by the DEQ and the Authority throughout the fiscal year to cover administrative costs and project reimbursements.

#### **VIII. ASSURANCES**

The final guidelines from the EPA set forth provisions that the state must provide certain assurances in order to qualify for capitalization grant funding. Such assurances are incorporated into the Operating Agreement and are included here by reference.

#### **IX. CRITERIA AND METHOD FOR DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS**

The State of Michigan will provide financial assistance from the SRF to municipalities in the relative order that they appear on the PPL developed for the fiscal year covered by this IUP. It is probable, however, that lower-ranked communities will receive money sooner if higher-ranked communities are not ready to proceed.

As a result of the DEQ's review, 30 projects totaling \$346,735,000 have expressed their intent to proceed this fiscal year and are included on the FY2000 PPL. Staff also identified 12 projects and/or segments equaling \$1.17 billion that will be considered for funding in the future.

Thus, 42 different projects totaling \$1.517 billion are identified on the PPL (attachment 1), along with a brief description, their total priority points, population to be served, targeted binding commitment date, and targeted binding commitment amount. The PPL also identifies the project priority categories in which each project received points.

The FY2000 PPL is included as part of the IUP process, and was presented as part of the public hearing. A separate copy of the final PPL is available from the MFS.

Section 5309 of 1994 PA 451 permits the DEQ to limit funding in certain circumstances to maximize funds and achieve greater environmental gains. It reads:

*To ensure that a disproportionate share of available funds for a given fiscal year is not committed to a single sewage treatment work project or storm water project, the department may segment a sewage treatment work project if either of the following criteria is present:*

*(a) The cost of the proposed project is more than 30 percent of the amount available in the fund.*

*(b) Upon application of a municipality, the department has approved a municipality's application for segmenting a project.*

Financial assistance to municipalities during FY2000 will consist solely of straight loans. There will be no guarantees of indebtedness.

## **X. PROJECT PRIORITY**

The state Clean Water Assistance Act, now codified in Part 53, Clean Water Assistance, of the Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act, 1994 PA 451, requires the SRF to offer assistance in priority order from the state's annual PPL. The criteria used to prioritize the projects are contained in the Act, with details set forth in administrative rules (R323.951 to R323.965).

This FY2000 IUP and PPL includes projects seeking Orders of Approval (the state's binding commitment) between October 1, 1999 and September 30, 2000. Letters were sent to those on the PPL to identify the fundable and contingency projects. Communities with projects in the fundable range must negotiate a milestone schedule with the MFS project manager assigned to their project.

Historically, many projects in the contingency range of the PPL have been funded when others in the fundable range fail to satisfactorily meet program requirements in a timely manner. Therefore, it is imperative that municipal officials work closely with the DEQ and the Authority to ensure that no opportunity for funding is lost. Attachment 2 identified the fundable and contingency projects for FY2000.

**NOTE: There is no actual or implied guarantee that inclusion on the PPL or the IUP will constitute a commitment of financial assistance from the SRF. All program requirements must be satisfied before a binding commitment will be offered and a loan closed.**

## **XI. EPA-AUTOMATED CLEARING HOUSE ACTIVITIES**

The EPA employs an Automated Clearing House (ACH) to make disbursements of federal funds to the SRF. For FY2000 Michigan anticipates drawing on the ACH according to the following schedule:

<b>1st Quarter</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$ 0 million</b>	<b>Request processing - first quarter, FY2000</b>
<b>2nd Quarter</b>		<b>\$25 million</b>	<b>Request processing - second quarter, FY2000</b>
<b>3rd Quarter</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$25 million</b>	<b>Request processing - third quarter, FY2000</b>
<b>4th Quarter</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$19.4 million</b>	<b>Request processing - fourth quarter, FY2000</b>

As project (or program administrative) costs are incurred, one request for disbursement may be submitted by the local project's authorized representative (or state agencies) each month. The request for disbursement of funds will be sent directly to the DEQ, who will then process the

request as part of a weekly draw request. Upon delivery to its office, the Authority will execute the fund drawdown electronically by transferring money from the federal ACH and state accounts. The amounts for FY2000 are drawn at 43.7 percent and 56.3 percent, respectively.

Moneys will be automatically deposited into the debt service reserve account of the SRF, while funds are electronically wired to the municipality's bank from an SRF account that holds funds from a taxable state issue.

## **XII. PUBLIC REVIEW AND COMMENT**

In order to satisfy public participation requirements, the DEQ held a public hearing on the IUP and PPL on September 14, 1999 at 1:30 p.m. in Lansing, Michigan. The hearing was announced in newspapers throughout the state, published in the DEQ Calendar of Events, individually noticed to each municipality on the proposed FY2000 PPL along with their consulting engineer, and sent to interested parties.

Items addressed in the public hearing included Michigan's draft PPL, draft IUP, priority point assignment, planned funding schedules, and proposed binding commitment amounts for projects which might be assisted with SRF moneys during FY2000. The hearing provided an opportunity for municipalities and other interested parties to comment and request changes to their projects' ranking criteria, if necessary.

Questions about this IUP may be directed to:

**Mr. Thomas Kamppinen, Chief  
Municipal Facilities Section  
Environmental Assistance Division  
Department of Environmental Quality  
PO Box 30457  
Lansing, MI 48909  
Telephone: 517-373-2161  
Fax: 517-335-0743  
E-Mail: kamppint@deq.state.mi.us**

## **XIII. ORIGINATION OF DOCUMENTS**

The Chief of the Municipal Facilities Section of the Department of Environmental Quality is responsible for issuing the Intended Use Plan. It is a collaborative effort of MFS staff who provide data for its development.



# MUNICIPAL FACILITIES SECTION, ENVIRONMENTAL ASSISTANCE DIVISION, MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

TOWN CENTER 2ND FLOOR, P.O. BOX 30457, LANSING, MI 48909-7957 (PHONE: 517-373-2161)

Michigan Clean Water State Revolving Fund

Final Fiscal Year 2000 Project Priority List By Rank

Loan Assistance Ranking For Wastewater Treatment Works Projects

Reported on: 10/18/1999 10:36:49 AM

Page 1 of 1

Rank	Project Number	Project Name And Description			Water Quality Severity Points						Enf Pts	Pop.	Pop. Pts	Exist. Disch	Rec Waters	Dil. Ratio	Rat. Pts	Tot Pts	Bind.Com Date	Bind.Com. Amt.
					DO	NUT	TOX	MICR	GWD	Tot										
PROJECTS WITH PRIOR YEAR SEGMENTS																				
1	5175-02	Detroit	Wayne Co	CSO: Add Clarifiers-Seg 2	100	100	0	28	0	228	300	3100000	100	24.17	54	0.4476	85	713	06/01/2000	\$58,890,000
1	5175-03	Detroit	Wayne Co	CSO: Future Segments	100	100	0	28	0	228	300	3100000	100	24.17	54	0.4476	85	713	Future	\$878,270,000
2	5006-02	Port Huron	St Clair Co.	Swr Sep - Seg 2 (Items 27, 30, 37, 38)	0	30	0	27	0	57	300	21692	90	2.67	30	0.0890	85	532	03/02/2000	\$9,985,000
2	5006-03	Port Huron	St Clair Co.	Swr Sep - Seg 3 (Items 3, 4)	0	30	0	27	0	57	300	21692	90	2.67	30	0.0890	85	532	06/01/2000	\$3,000,000
2	5006-04	Port Huron	St Clair Co.	Swr Sep - Seg 4 (Items 11, 14, 15, 16, 18, 43, 45)	0	30	0	27	0	57	300	21692	90	2.67	30	0.0890	85	532	06/01/2000	\$7,850,000
2	5006-05	Port Huron	St Clair Co.	Swr Sep - Future Segments	0	30	0	27	0	57	300	21692	90	2.67	30	0.0890	85	532	Future	\$41,460,000
3	5143-02	Detroit	Wayne Co	2nd Det Riv Outfall - Seg 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	300	3100000	100	2.6	650	0.0040	55	455	11/23/1999	\$53,475,000
4	5127-02	Trenton	Wayne Co	New PS., Relief Swrs, CS & Int Upgrds - Seg 2	0	1	0	27	0	28	300	20586	85	0.1	200	0.0005	40	453	03/02/2000	\$18,635,000
4	5127-03	Trenton	Wayne Co	Future Segments	0	1	0	27	0	28	300	20586	85	0.1	200	0.0005	40	453	Future	\$2,075,000
5	5145-04	Manistee	Manistee Co	CSO:Swr Sep-Future Segments	0	0	0	27	0	27	300	7805	80	0.116	1820	0.0001	25	432	Future	\$1,000,000
6	5154-03	Southfield	Oakland Co	CS:Seg 3	1	0	0	37	0	38	0	5000	75	0.005	2.8	0.0018	40	153	08/31/2000	\$14,530,000
PROJECTS WITHOUT PRIOR YEAR SEGMENTS																				
7	5117-34	Wayne Co	Downriver	SMP/Electronic O&M Manual	17	31	50	27	0	125	300	332910	100	0.159	0.1	>.6000	100	625	03/02/2000	\$4,050,000
8	5005-12	Lansing	Ingham Co	CSO: Swr Sep - Moore Trunk/Area K - Seg 12	7	100	0	37	0	144	300	62301	95	1.268	48	0.0264	70	609	03/02/2000	\$10,400,000
8	5005-13	Lansing	Ingham Co	CSO: Swr Sep - Future Segments	7	100	0	37	0	144	300	62301	95	1.268	48	0.0264	70	609	Future	\$108,275,000
9	5192-01	Geo W Kuhn DD	Oakland Co	CSO:12 Towns RTB Imp-Seg 1	12	12	0	1	0	25	300	209000	100	12.16	1.7	>.6000	100	525	08/31/2000	\$29,000,000
9	5192-02	Geo W Kuhn DD	Oakland Co	CSO:12 Towns RTB Imp-Future Segments	12	12	0	1	0	25	300	209000	100	12.16	1.7	>.6000	100	525	Future	\$115,000,000
10	5194-01	Bay City	Bay Co	WWTP & RTB Upgrd	0	0	50	0	0	50	300	46257	90	12	580	0.0207	70	510	03/02/2000	\$29,590,000
11	5195-01	Three Oaks	Berrien Co	Swr Repl/Rehab	2	0	0	34	0	36	300	1786	55	0.015	0	>.6000	100	491	08/31/2000	\$4,340,000
12	5131-01	Monroe Co	Carleton	Upgrd/Expnd WWTP (refinance)	0	0	0	0	0	0	300	3007	70	1.07	0.3	>.6000	100	470	08/31/2000	\$5,405,000
13	5184-01	Lenawee Co	Rollin/Woodstock Twps	WWTP Upgrd/Expnd	1	0	0	4	0	5	300	4925	75	0.84	1.7	0.4941	85	465	08/31/2000	\$4,465,000
14	5190-01	St Joseph	Berrien Co	Seg 1; Swr Sep, Rehab	0	1	0	27	0	28	300	9214	80	0.5	890	0.0006	40	448	03/02/2000	\$1,735,000
14	5190-02	St Joseph	Berrien Co	Swr Sep, Rehab-Future Segments	0	1	0	27	0	28	300	9214	80	0.5	890	0.0006	40	448	Future	\$1,495,000
15	5129-03	Sault Ste Marie	Chippewa Co	CSO:Swr Sep-Future Segments	0	1	0	27	0	28	300	9323	80	0.043	78000	0.0000	25	433	Future	\$11,210,000
16	5193-01	Scottville	Mason	Swr rehab: WWTP exp	0	0	0	24	0	24	300	1287	50	1.04	390	0.0027	55	429	08/31/2000	\$3,765,000
17	5134-01	Warren	Macomb Co	Solids Handling, Tert. Upgrd, Seg 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	144864	95	23.56	1.4	>.6000	100	195	08/31/2000	\$14,590,000
17	5134-02	Warren	Macomb Co	WWTP Upgrds, Seg 2.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	144864	95	23.56	1.4	>.6000	100	195	Future	\$7,245,000
18	5172-01	Imlay City	Lapeer Co	WWTP Upgrd/ Expnd, Swr Sep	3	2	3	1	0	9	0	2921	70	0.56	0.5	>.6000	100	179	08/31/2000	\$3,100,000
19	5169-01	Mt. Pleasant	Isabella Co	WWTP Expnd	6	0	0	0	0	6	0	41339	90	3.5	73	0.0479	70	166	06/01/2000	\$6,050,000
20	5183-01	Trenton	Wayne Co	WWTP Solids Handling	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20586	85	5.06	170	0.0298	70	155	Future	\$3,915,000
21	5157-01	Oakland Co	White Lake Twp	CS (Pressure Swrs) - Pontiac Lk/English Villas	0	0	0	0	50	50	0	1673	55	0.108	999999	0.0000	25	130	08/31/2000	\$4,690,000
22	5178-01	Calhoun Co	Tekonsha	WWTP Expnd/Upgrd	0	4	0	3	0	7	0	824	45	1.095	20	0.0547	70	122	08/31/2000	\$2,325,000
23	5177-01	Port Huron	St. Clair Co.	WWTP Residuals Mgt Facilities	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45693	90	13.2	165000	0.0001	25	115	08/31/2000	\$8,500,000
24	5165-01	Orleans Twp	Ionia Co	CS,WWTP-Long Lk Area	0	0	0	0	50	50	0	587	40	0.04	999999	0.0000	25	115	03/02/2000	\$3,080,000
25	5179-01	Coopersville	Ottawa Co	PS Upgrds, FM,Swr Repl	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3640	70	0.84	830	0.0010	40	110	08/31/2000	\$590,000
26	5187-01	Marysville	St Clair	WWTP Exp	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9505	80	2.49	165000	0.0000	25	105	08/31/2000	\$2,725,000
27	5167-01	Petersburg	Monroe Co	WWTP Upgrd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1191	50	0.17	33	0.0052	55	105	08/31/2000	\$810,000
28	5189-01	Alpine Twp	Kent Co	CS	0	0	0	0	50	50	0	166	30	0.012	999999	0.0000	25	105	06/01/2000	\$1,605,000
29	5168-01	Berrien Springs	Berrien Co	New WWTP,CS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1927	60	0.29	1080	0.0003	40	100	08/31/2000	\$5,820,000
30	5139-01	Billings Twp	Gladwin Co	CS, WWTP (Grav/Press & Oxi Ditch w/Wtld Dis)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3429	70	0.24	999999	0.0000	25	95	08/31/2000	\$22,990,000
31	5176-01	Jackson Co	Napoleon/Grass Lk Tw	CS, Int - Wolf Lk Area	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1501	55	1.17	999999	0.0000	25	80	08/31/2000	\$5,555,000
32	5188-01	Stockbridge	Ingham Co	WWTP Upgrd/Expnd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1225	50	0.14	999999	0.0000	25	75	03/02/2000	\$1,990,000
33	5171-01	Inverness Twp	Cheboygan Co	CS, WWTP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	287	30	0.053	999999	0.0000	25	55	08/31/2000	\$3,200,000
42	Projects														Total Binding Commitment Dollars				\$1,516,680,000	